



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

must all appreciate the well pointed sarcasm of the wag who suggested that the Nobel prize which went to Baroness von Suttner was due to some American, and that we should have contended for it, even to a naval demonstration against Norway.

Perhaps the most effective method toward active peace work with us will be to fairly investigate the causes, as well as results, of some of our own wars, the last three of which can be shown, if not wholly indefensible, to be without results that might not have been much better obtained by peaceful methods.

Benton, Schouler and others furnish prompt proof to any one seeking it in sincerity that our war with Mexico was absolutely indefensible and inexcusable.

Coming to our great war, the task is more difficult by reason of the sentiment that has been woven around it, and yet it should begin now to dawn on us that we settled little by the four years of strife and blood that might not have been settled otherwise; and then as to settlements, let us answer with ourselves and among ourselves if some of these things that we counted settled for many years after Appomattox are not coming rapidly again to be unsettled; and while we prate loudly of the benefits that have come of that war, we should remember against these the costs, *the fearful costs* in human sacrifice, and the tax burdens, heavy after nearly half a century.

As to our last war, it is a conviction with me that it was precipitated by influences and inheritances that came to us from the great war.

In the early nineties I wrote the editor of the *Arena* to know if he would give space to an article warning against a growing war spirit in the South and based very largely on the desire to prove by a war test our fidelity to the Union. The editor replied that he had not thought there was a demand for that sort of matter, but that he would consider it if I cared to prepare such article. It is said that men write for the magazines and their grandchildren may read the articles; and as I watched from month to month for the appearance of my paper I thought a war would beat it in spite of me. It came, though, ahead of our war with Spain, and in that war, with its boisterous origin, I saw verified some of the propositions and conclusions that I had set forth in the paper; and at the Thanksgiving following the war I heard the remarkable statement from the pulpit that if we got no other benefit from our war with Spain the better cementing of the two sections had fully justified it. Then further on this sort of thing, I read in an influential journal the editorial expression that the war had brought results of this kind, but was too soon over for a complete success, and that we really needed one on a larger scale! This, all "in order to form a more perfect union, insure domestic tranquillity," etc.

It speaks little for our civilization that the costs in money of our wars is having more to do toward turning us to the study of peace than considerations of humanity; but let us welcome the promptings, whatever be the motives, and let us take up the work in Texas in gratefulness that a start has been made.

Prof. John W. Burgess, in his valuable historical series, says that the time has come when the South should admit her error in precipitating the war, and the North her error in Reconstruction. It is always difficult for individuals or groups to come straight up to the admission

of error, and in this is found an impediment to the best peace work.

Still, we must have the proper peace mood, we who would work for it. When many were coming to the baptism of John while he was preaching in the wilderness, that rough man of God warned them that they must bring forth fruits meet for repentance, and whatever may yet be the individual or collective opinion as to either or both of Professor Burgess's propositions, we must at least see, those of us who would work for a world peace, that the time has come when the two sections should quit falling on each other's necks in adoration of the way in which they once killed each other.

WAXAHACHIE, TEXAS.

## International Jurisprudence.

[Extract from the reply of Hon. Elihu Root upon the presentation of Diploma by the Mexican Academy of Jurisprudence and Legislation of Mexico, October 4, 1907.]

We are passing, undoubtedly, into a new era of international communication. We have turned our backs upon the old days of armed invasion; and the people of every civilized country are constantly engaged in the peaceable invasion of every other civilized country. The science, the literature, the customs, the lessons of experience, the skill, the spirit of every country, exercise an influence upon every other. In this peaceful interchange of the products of intellect, in this constant passing to and fro of the people of different countries of the civilized world, we find in each land a system of law peculiar to the country itself, and answering to what I believe to be a just description of all law which regulates the relations of individuals to each other, in being a formulation of the customs of the civil community. These systems of law differ from each other as the conditions, the customs of each people differ from those of every other people. But there has arisen in recent years quite a new and distinct influence producing legal enactment and furnishing occasion for legal development. That is the entrance into the minds of men of the comparatively new ideas of individual freedom and individual equality. The idea that all men are born equal, that every man is entitled to his life, his liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the great declarations of principle designed to give effect to the fundamental ideas of liberty and equality, are not the outcome of conditions or customs of any particular people, but they are common to all mankind.

Before the jurists and lawyers of the world there lies the task of adapting each special system of municipal law to the enforcement of the general principles which have come into the life of mankind within so recent a time, and which are cosmopolitan and world-wide and belong in no country especially. These principles have to be fitted to your laws in Mexico and our laws in the United States, and to the French laws in France and the German laws in Germany, and the task before the jurists and lawyers of the world is to formulate, to elaborate, to secure the enactment and enforcement of such practical provisions as to weld together in each land the old system of municipal law, which regulates the relations of individuals with each other in accordance with the time-honored traditions and customs of the race and country, and these principles of universal human freedom. Now,

that task is something that cannot be accomplished except by scientific processes, by the study of comparative jurisprudence, by the application of minds of the highest order in the most painstaking and practical way. In the adaptation of these new ideas common to all free people, the best minds of every people should assist every other people and receive assistance from every other people. The study of comparative jurisprudence, apparently dry, purely scientific, is as important to the well being of the citizen in the streets of Mexico or Washington as those scientific observations and calculations which seem to be purely abstract have proved to be to the mariner on the ocean or to the engineer of great works of construction.

### The Greatest Moral Question of the Century.

The *Broadway Tabernacle Tidings*, the organ of the church in New York of which Dr. Charles E. Jefferson is pastor, had in its January issue a timely and trenchant criticism of the position of the *Outlook* on the subject of our country's armaments. This criticism seems to us to be quite justified by the extraordinary position which the *Outlook* has taken in this matter, — a position which is totally incompatible with the American principle that *the people are the rulers of this nation*, and that the President and Congress are only their servants. If intelligent individuals and great papers like the *Outlook* are to have nothing to do with the determination of the national policy on the subject of increase or decrease of armaments, then we are far along toward the substitution of monarchical for democratic government. The criticism is as follows :

"If the *Outlook* does not wish to lose its prestige for leadership in the realm of moral thought and action, it cannot afford to indulge often in such editorials as the recent one in which it replied to certain strictures of the Rev. Dr. Dole of Massachusetts on the attitude of the *Outlook* to the naval policy of our government. Dr. Dole is a clear thinker and uses English with discrimination and illuminating energy, and the editors of the *Outlook* cut a sorry figure in comparison with him whenever they discuss the subject of armaments. Among other things Dr. Dole said: 'The *Outlook* stands for the ideal things, it is supposed to believe in the application of Christian principles in the world. It holds that such principles may be trusted. Why, then, does the *Outlook* care to go over to the side of the men who distrust both God and man and help keep the battleships menacing the world?' To which the editors of the *Outlook* reply: 'Would Mr. Dole abolish the police force of Boston? If his household were attacked by assassins in the middle of the night, would he refrain from using every known electrical device at his hand for calling up the police patrol to come with the utmost military precision to protect the household?'

"This is saddening! We expect puerilities in some papers, but not in the *Outlook*. The old fallacy that our huge and growing navy is only a police force has been exploded a thousand times, and the man is belated who makes use of it. If Mr. Metcalf asks for sixty-nine

millions more for new ships, we are not to answer all criticisms by asking, 'Would you disband the police force?' When the President asks for four new battleships instead of one, and says, 'plenty of torpedo boats and destroyers should be built,' we are all to keep still or have our ears boxed with the reminder that when assassins are coming we all call for the policeman!

"In regard to the President's last astounding recommendation the *Outlook* says: 'On the question whether we ought to add four battleships to our navy this year the *Outlook* has no opinion to express.' Of course not. Because the *Outlook* has abdicated its position as leader of high and independent opinion. It believes that this matter should be left to be determined for us by the Administration and Congress. How strange all this sounds in the *Outlook*, the very paper which has in its high moments always refused to bow to the decision of councils in church and the conclusions of politicians in state, calling the most exalted heads and the most august tribunals to a higher judgment seat!

"The Broadway Tabernacle Pulpit protests against the inexcusable and mischievous squandering of our national treasure on the further development of the enginery of slaughter. It is to be hoped that the American church will not be content to remain noncommittal or apologetic when face to face with the greatest moral question of the century."

### New Books.

THE INTERNATIONAL LAW AND DIPLOMACY OF THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR. By Prof. Amos S. Hershey. New York: The Macmillan Co. Cloth, 394 pages.

This book uses the history of the contest between Russia and Japan to illustrate and bring up to date the subject of international law. The writer makes frequent use of Asakawa's "Russo-Japanese Conflict," of diplomatic correspondence and press dispatches as sources of information.

One who has read Professor Lawrence on "War and Neutrality in the Far East" will find the author following in Lawrence's steps with enthusiasm. While Professor Hershey does not write in such a clear and condensed style as Professor Lawrence, he goes into his subject more exhaustively than the famous British writer, and gives his reader satisfaction on the minor as well as the greater legal questions that arose in the struggle. He has a complete statement of the causes which led to the war, and, while he writes as an impartial historian, shows that the Japanese, instead of being a treacherous foe, as was charged by the Czar in connection with their sudden attack on the Russian fleet without formal declaration, acted in accordance with a notice previously given to St. Petersburg as to their imperative duty to defend themselves when the negotiations between the two governments were broken off.

Contrary to the opinion which prevails in many quarters, Professor Hershey also shows that the American government was in spirit neutral in its relations to both combatants, although many American citizens expressed sympathy for Japan.

Among the questions discussed in the book are the legal limits within which wireless telegraphy may be used by war correspondents, the violation of the ocean